

Journal of Policy Science Vol.11

## **Why Pro-democracy Movement can't Bring their Country to Democracy: Relation between Pro-democracy Movement and Public Sphere**

Kazuya TAKAKUWA \*

### **Abstract**

In this note, I will focus on relation between pro-democracy movement and public sphere. The significance of this research have two dimensions. First, analysis of democratization are mostly based on one single case study. Therefore, it is valuable to bring the analysis into a broader sense, which focus on the pro-democracy movement organization, one of the actors in democratic movement, in order to discover the reasons of the failure. Second, there is a research gap in the relation between pro-democracy movement and public sphere. Up to now, relation between social movement, publicness and public sphere have been discussed. However, social movement have many clarification like pro-democracy movement and new social movement so relation between each of social movements, publicness and public sphere have to be discussed too.

I have two hypotheses for reasons why pro-democracy movements could not last long. The first one is that they could not institutionalize the repertoire of contention that represent how social movement bring publicness to public sphere. The second one is bureaucracy with few publicness are affected by the dysfunctional aspect of bureaucracy. Pro-democracy movements are sometimes considered as no-leader movement but in this research I will prove how bureaucratic they are in reality. What I found about the first hypothesis is that pro-democracy

---

\* Undergraduate Student, College of Policy Science, Ritsumeikan University

movements could institutionalize internally but not externally, so they could not mobilize the public to have more participation. It could be seen in Umbrella revolution in Hong Kong. For the second hypothesis, I found a possibility that some pro-democracy movements are affected by dysfunctional aspect of bureaucracy. “Otpor!”, a civic protest group in Serbia that ousted former president and Umbrella Movement are good examples for this. If they could achieve external institutionalization and gain multiple publicness, pro-democracy movements could have significant contribution to the success of both democratic transition and consolidation.

## Introduction

Democratization is a process which leads to a more open, more participatory and less authoritarian society. Democracy is a system of government which embodies, in a variety of institutions and mechanisms, the ideal of political power based on the will of the people.

In places from Latin America to Africa, Europe and Asia, numbers of authoritarian regimes have given way to democratic forces, increasingly responsive Governments and increasingly open societies have been found. Many States and their people have embarked upon a process of democratization for the first time. Others have moved to restore their democratic roots.

However, if we look at the recent pro-democracy movements, we can understand that the result of pro-democracy movements are not always satisfying. Sheri Berman, professor of political science department at Columbia University talked about democratization at TED in 2014 and said that almost all democratization failed and Arab Spring that got many attentions have been turned into “Arab Winter”. This is because soon after uprising transition happened, many of them in fact collapsed very quickly back into dictatorship as in Egypt.

According to Easterly 2006, the factors that affect a developing democratic country can be external or internal. Democratization in itself is differs by case. Any factors that affects democratization also affects other factors in a complicated algorithm. Each factor when analyzed in isolation can retard, obstruct or promote democratization. The process of democratization is unique and different in every nation.

I can understand that the democratization is differs by case, but I think that many research have focused too much on analyzing just one single pro-democracy movement Therefore, I want to research in another aspect and compare cases of pro-democracy movement in each of the countries.

In this note, I will focus on relation between pro-democracy movement organization and public sphere. The significance of this research has two dimensions. First, as I have mentioned, most of the past analyses of democratization are single case study. Therefore, it is valuable to focus on one of the key actors of democratization: pro-democracy movement organizations to discover the reason of failure of pro-democracy movements. Second, there is a research gap in

the relation between pro-democracy movement and public sphere. Up to now, relation between social movement, publicness and public sphere have been discussed. However, social movement have many clarification like pro-democracy movement and new social movement so relation between each of social movements, publicness and public sphere have to be discussed too.

Therefore, this research would contribute for the studies of pro-democracy movements in two ways.

## **1. Prior researches**

### **1.1. Understanding of Habermas and the Public Sphere (Habermas:1994)**

Public sphere is an area in social life where individuals can come together to freely discuss and identify societal problems, and through that discussion influence political actions. It plays the role that connecting System (State) with Society. Publicness is a norm, rule that should be committed to make mutual coexistence and social cooperation possible for people who have different values. This publicness (or publicity) of representation was not constituted that is, as a public sphere; rather, it was something like a status attribute, if this term may be permitted.

### **1.2. Relation between social movements and Habermas public sphere theory**

According to Habermas (1994), Social movements have two ways to access public sphere. The first one is social movements bring publicness to public sphere. Public opinions created from structure of communication of public sphere will have influence on State. The second one is social movements can directly influence the state by their actions through public sphere. Governments will react to their actions and public sphere will change. Next, from the view of Ando (2013), there are two roles that social movements play. First is that social movements will propose a problem (publicness) that never been spotlighted before to public sphere. Second is social movements can intensify ability of the subject that propose a problem to a public sphere.

### **1.3. Repertoires of contention**

Repertoires of contention refers, in social movement theory, to the set of various protest-related tools and actions available to a movement or related organization in a given time frame. It represents how social movements will bring publicness to public sphere. According to Portan and Diani (1999), repertoires of contention is depended on external factors. Therefore, as I have mentioned above, each of social movements have their own repertoire of contention and multiple publicness. It is very valuable to see it in order to know how external factors affect each

of social movements. Repertoire of contention could be divide into two types, conventional one and unconventional one. Conventional one creates no challenge to government, just like peaceful demonstrations. They would inform the police about time, place, number of participants of the protest so they do not intend to cause troubles to the government. In contrast, unconventional one is demonstrations without former announcement nor permission.

According to Dalton (1994), power of environmental movements come from multiply political means. Environmental movements could work in both conventional and unconventional means that gain multiple publicness so it is important to see whether pro-democracy movement could work in both two types of repertoires of contention. On the other hand, institutionalization also could be divided into two parts: external and internal. External institutionalization represents relations of the pro-democracy movement with an external organization, for example company or state, Internal one represents institutionalization of social movement within the organization (Doherty: 2002).

#### **1.4. Research Question**

Why pro-democracy movement could not exercise their influence continuously in democratization. According to Iwasaki, Democratization can be divided into two parts: democratic transition and democratic consolidation. Pro-democracy movement have played a key role in transition to democratic system, but we have to see their role in democratic consolidation too because they could be one of the major contributors. I made two hypothesis to answer my research question. One is that pro-democracy movements could not institutionalize the repertoire of contention. Second is that pro-democracy movement with few publicness are likely to be affected by the dysfunctional aspects of bureaucracy. Cases to be used in this research are pro-democracy movements from 1993 to now. This is because after "From dictatorship to democracy" written by gene-sharp was published, it seems that pro-democracy movements are inspired by gene sharp's theory. We may see some consistency in the pro-democracy movements after 1993. For the first hypothesis, by looking at why pro-democracy movements could not institutionalize, we can discover external factors affecting them and their characteristics. For the second hypothesis, by looking at the danger of bureaucracy, I will explain why people were leaving from pro-democracy movements gradually.

#### **1.5. Discussion**

Gaining multiple publicness is important for getting supporters so pro-democracy movement organizations have to gain multiple publicness. As I have explained at the part of prior research, external and internal institutionalizations and resistances have to be done to gain

multiple publicness. The reason why institutionalization of the repertoire of contention is needed for pro-democracy movements is that institutionalization would gain multiple publicness. When institutionalization of the repertoire of contention is achieved in organization, people can use the repertoire of contention of social movement organizations (SMO). External Institutionalization can give people peaceful mind and participate more when people want to bring publicness to public sphere. Then social movement organization can get multiple publicness in the end (Ando: 2013). However, pro-democracy movements could not institutionalize themselves because: first, resistance from country against conventional repertoire, and; second, private companies, including mass media will be under pressure by the country if they are in favor. Government would not allow any conventional pro-democracy movements. Therefore, it is difficult for them to use conventional repertoire of the contention. We can see the example of failure of institutionalization in Umbrella movement in Hong Kong. In 2014, student of Hong Kong protested and asked for universal suffrage. This protest is well known as Umbrella movement. During the Interview in 2015-09-25, by Minkei News Hong Kong, when Alex Chow, former secretary-general of the Hong Kong Federation of Students answered about why Umbrella movement could not succeed, he said that Umbrella movement lacked something. Student had boycotted their class but as part of Hong Kong society, we should've protested with other organization and people. If any other organizations and people want to join the protest of umbrella movement, as Ando explained that institutionalization firm publicness, people who want to bring publicness to public sphere will go without asking. However, they were not coming out because umbrella movement did not use conventional repertoire of the contention. However, umbrella movement had a conventional repertoire of the contention for junior and high school students. It was called civic lessons ("*Komin Lesson*"). I have had an interview with the member of Scholarism and Hong Kong student of federation. They shared how to gather supporters by civic lessons. These civic lessons were kind of lectures given by Scholarism for teaching junior and high school students about democracy and politics at public parks. It worked as Citizenship education. Ideologically it is unconventional, but this activity itself is conventional.

If anybody who have different publicness and want democracy could held this lesson for their achievement, they could maybe gain more supporters.

Up to now, I have explained my first hypothesis. And my second hypothesis is related to my first hypothesis: pro-democracy movement with few publicness have a danger of bureaucracy. To discuss this hypothesis, I have to explain about why pro-democracy movement are bureaucratic, although Pro-democracy movement sometimes are considered as no-leader movement.

Leader of pro-democracy movement in Arab and Eastern Europe said that they read Gene Sharp 『from dictatorship to democracy』 as bible and took a fundamental strategy. (Takiguti 2012). Sharp's key theme is that any power structure relies upon the subjects' obedience to the orders of the ruler(s) so organizations have to be high-planned and structural to weaken their

power. (Gene sharp: 1993)

According to the essays of Otpor!, they have division of labor like occupation group, advertisement group and so on. Also, we cannot overlook the relation between pro-democracy movements and the United States. The United State has funded so much for promoting democracy around the world. Otpor! is also no exception. Leader of Otpor! got funding from the United States too. Considering how the leader spent funding from the United States, power of the organization should be with high hierarchy. Pro-democracy movements meet three characteristic of bureaucracy: labor specialization, high hierarchy and top-down. If they apply gene sharp's theory that consist of non-violence and civil obedience, they have to be bureaucratic. Moreover, in reality, leader of Otpor! said that Otpor! was a high-planned organization during interview. Therefore, pro-democracy movements have to be considered as bureaucratic. However, bureaucracy with few publicness are dangerous. According to Doyle (2000), social movement prevent themselves from danger of bureaucracy by having multiple publicness in them. It means that pro-democracy movements with few publicness will be affected by the dysfunctional aspect of bureaucracy. According to Endo (2014), participant of Occupy central with Love and Peace decline Umbrella movement even though the three leaders of it are wise and have much knowledge about demonstrations. Strike of all students started with free will of students. They did not sympathy with Occupy central by logical supporters like professors and adults. (Furumai: 2014) Occupy central was inspired by gene sharp's strategy too, just like occupy Wall street in 2011 in the United States. Therefore, we can say that bureaucracy brought by occupy love and peace caused apathy among participants as dysfunctional aspect of bureaucracy.

## 2. Conclusion

In this note, I tried to find out why pro-democracy movements could not keep their influence from view of relation between pro-democracy movements and public sphere. As summary, I found that pro-democracy movements have internal institutionalization (bureaucracy) and resistance but external institutionalization as the repertoire of contentions. Therefore, they could not have gained multiple publicness. Moreover, few publicness have caused the dysfunctional aspect of democracy. However, what I found was if they could achieve external institutionalization and get multiple publicness, pro-democracy movement could be a key contributor to democratic consolidation. If unconventional repertoire is defined as resistance movement, I think that the conventional one is giving people chance to express opinion (Ito: 2012). What pro-democracy activists have to think about is how they could practice both movements.

There is still some future work for my research. First is that I need to research more on different social movements to continue my study because in this note I have just touched a few. Moreover, I need to research about publicness in each of country where pro-democracy

movements have been occurred. I claimed that few publicness is a characteristic made by external factors around Pro-democracy movement. However, we can make hypothesis that where pro-democracy movement have taken place do not have enough social sectors and capital to firm publicness. My third future task is I have to clarify the role of pro-democracy movement from democratic transition to democratic consolidation. The way that how social movements have influenced government has not yet clarified so studying it is valuable not only for pro-democracy movement but also social movement.

## References

- BBC (15 May 2000) Analysis of Otpor's challenge to Milosevic  
Chareles Tilly (2012) Social Movements in 1768 to 2012, Routledge  
Endo Homare (2014) barricade of Hong Kong Akashi Shobo  
Gene Sharp (2012) From dictatorship to democracy Tikuma Gakugei Bunko  
Habermas (1994) The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere Miraisha  
Harutoshi Hunabashi (2006) Kanryouseika to Network (bureaucracy and network) Meneruba Shobo  
Hong Kong Keizai Sinbun (25 Sep 2015) "Interview with Alex Chow and Agnes Chow who took Umbrella Movement"  
Horie Tadashi (2007) (fundamental knowledge of political science and public administration) Iti geisha  
Hoshikawa Tuyoshi (2001) Koukyouken no shakaigaku (Sociology in public sphere) Houritsu Bunkasha  
Ito Masaaki (2012) Demo no Media Ron (media studies of demo) Tikuma Shobo  
Saito Zyunichi (2010) Koukyousei no Shakaigaku (political theory of publicness) Nakanishiya Shuppan  
Takemasa And (2013) Repertoires in Social Movements and Publicity

